

A SIMPLE PROOF OF UNIQUE CONTINUATION FOR J -HOLOMORPHIC CURVES

MICHAEL VANVALKENBURGH

ABSTRACT. In this expository paper, we prove strong unique continuation for J -holomorphic curves by first giving a simple proof of Aronszajn's theorem in the special case of the two-dimensional flat Laplacian.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the study of J -holomorphic curves and symplectic topology as presented by McDuff and Salamon [7], a basic fact is the strong unique continuation property for J -holomorphic curves. In their book, the strong unique continuation property is a first step in a chain of events leading to the proof that, for a generic almost complex structure J , the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^*(A, \Sigma; J)$ of simple J -holomorphic A -curves is a smooth finite dimensional manifold, and from there to the construction of the Gromov-Witten invariants for a suitable class of symplectic manifolds (see pages 4 and 38 of [7] for the outline of this approach).

McDuff and Salamon give three proofs of the unique continuation property. The first proof is a few lines long but cites Aronszajn's theorem as proven in [2]. The second and third proofs are given self-contained treatments, and, moreover, the methods find further application in their book. The second proof uses the Hartman–Wintner theorem [6] (proven in McDuff and Salamon's Appendix E.4), which in fact implies the needed special case of Aronszajn's theorem, and the third proof uses the Carleman similarity principle and the Riemann-Roch theorem (proven in their Appendix C).

Here we return to the first method of proof, but give a simplified argument. The method is well known in certain branches of partial differential equations; it is the method of weighted integral estimates depending on a parameter. This is also the approach of Aronszajn [2], but it goes back even further, to Carleman [3]. For a general treatment with some historical comments, one may consult Sections 17.1 and 17.2 of Hörmander's book [9] or his corresponding paper [8]. However, all these references give much more than is needed for our application. Here we present only what is needed for J -holomorphic curves.

We give the full details for the case of C^∞ J -holomorphic curves; for J -holomorphic curves in Sobolev spaces with minimal assumptions, discussed in McDuff and Salamon's book, one may find the appropriate modifications in Sections 17.1 and 17.2 of Hörmander's book [9]. Here we focus on the C^∞ case, for ease of exposition and since the C^∞ case is sufficient for

Date: May 1, 2009.

many purposes; after all, in Gromov's original definition all J -holomorphic curves are C^∞ [5].

The weighted integral estimates will depend on a parameter $0 < h \ll 1$ which may be interpreted as "Planck's constant", as appearing in the correspondence principle of the old quantum theory, or, more generally, as appearing in semiclassical analysis [4]. The general idea is that as h tends to zero, asymptotic analysis reveals the classical mechanics of the operator's symbol, interpreted as a Hamiltonian function. Hence symplectic geometry plays a role beneath the surface.

We begin by recalling the basic definitions, so that our presentation is self-contained. Let (Σ, j) be a Riemann surface and (M, J) an almost complex manifold. A smooth function $u : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is called a **J -holomorphic curve** if its differential du is a complex linear map with respect to j and J ; that is, if

$$J \circ du = du \circ j,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\bar{\partial}_J(u) := \frac{1}{2}(du + J \circ du \circ j) = 0.$$

Unique continuation is a local problem, so for our purposes we may take the domain of u to be a connected neighborhood $X \subset \mathbb{C}$ of the origin, writing the elements of X as $x = x_1 + ix_2$, and we may take M to be $\mathbb{C}^n$. Hence we are interested in those $u \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}^n)$ satisfying

$$(1) \quad \partial_{x_1} u + J(u) \partial_{x_2} u = 0,$$

where $J : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow GL(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is, say, a C^1 function such that $J^2 = -I$.

The main point of this paper is to give a simple, elementary proof of the following strong unique continuation result:

Theorem 1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a connected neighborhood of 0, and suppose $u, v \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}^n)$ satisfy (1) for some C^1 almost complex structure $J : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow GL(2n, \mathbb{R})$. If $u - v$ vanishes to infinite order at 0, then $u = v$ in X .*

Acknowledgements. I thank Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon for pointing out that the Hartman–Wintner theorem implies the special case of Aronszajn's theorem. Moreover, it is a pleasure to thank them for their excellent books.

2. PROOF OF UNIQUE CONTINUATION

Let $\Delta = \partial_{x_1}^2 + \partial_{x_2}^2$ be the standard Laplacian. Since $(\partial_{x_1} J)J + J\partial_{x_1} J = 0$, we have that any solution u of (1) is also a solution of

$$\Delta u = (\partial_{x_2} J(u)) \partial_{x_1} u - (\partial_{x_1} J(u)) \partial_{x_2} u.$$

If v is another such function, then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(u - v) &= (\partial_{x_2} J(u)) \partial_{x_1} (u - v) + [\partial_{x_2} (J(u) - J(v))] \partial_{x_1} v \\ &\quad - (\partial_{x_1} J(u)) \partial_{x_2} (u - v) - [\partial_{x_1} (J(u) - J(v))] \partial_{x_2} v.\end{aligned}$$

Also, of course,

$$J(u) - J(v) = \int_0^1 dJ(v + \tau(u - v)) d\tau \cdot (u - v).$$

So, if $w := u - v$, then for some constant $C > 0$ we have

$$|\Delta w| \leq C(|w| + |\partial_{x_1} w| + |\partial_{x_2} w|).$$

Since we are considering fixed functions u and v , the constant is allowed to depend on u , v , and their derivatives.

Thus Theorem 1 is a consequence of the following unique continuation result, a special case of Aronszajn's theorem [2]. (We follow the presentation of Theorem 17.2.6 in Hörmander's book [9].)

Theorem 2. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a connected neighborhood of 0, and let $u \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}^n)$ be such that*

$$(2) \quad |\Delta u| \leq C(|u| + |\partial_{x_1} u| + |\partial_{x_2} u|).$$

If u vanishes to infinite order at 0, then $u = 0$ in X .

Proof. For notational purposes, we assume $n = 1$. The proof works line-by-line for the general case.

We first introduce conformal polar coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(x_1, x_2) = (e^t \cos \theta, e^t \sin \theta)$$

with $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in S^1$. Then, in these coordinates,

$$\partial_{x_1} = e^{-t} \cos \theta \partial_t - e^{-t} \sin \theta \partial_\theta,$$

$$\partial_{x_2} = e^{-t} \sin \theta \partial_t + e^{-t} \cos \theta \partial_\theta,$$

and

$$\Delta = e^{-2t}(\partial_t^2 + \partial_\theta^2).$$

Next, we “convexify” the coordinates. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and let T be such that

$$t = T + e^{\epsilon T}.$$

As noted by Hörmander [8], this change of coordinates comes from the work of Alinhac and Baouendi [1]. Then

$$\frac{\partial t}{\partial T} = 1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T} > 0,$$

and $T < t < T + 1 < T/2$ when $T < -2$. In these coordinates,

$$\partial_t^2 + \partial_\theta^2 = (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^{-2} \partial_T^2 - \epsilon^2 (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^{-3} e^{\epsilon T} \partial_T + \partial_\theta^2.$$

Multiplying by $(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2$, we get the operator

$$Q := \partial_T^2 + c(T)\partial_T + (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 \partial_\theta^2,$$

with

$$c(T) := -\epsilon^2(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^{-1} e^{\epsilon T}.$$

Our main tool is the following estimate:

Proposition 3. *For some $T_0 < 0$ and some $h_0 > 0$ we have*

$$(3) \quad h \iint (|U|^2 + |h\partial_T U|^2 + |h\partial_\theta U|^2 + |h^2\partial_T^2 U|^2 + |h^2\partial_{T,\theta}^2 U|^2 + |h^2\partial_\theta^2 U|^2) e^{-2T/h + \epsilon T} d\theta dT \\ \leq C \iint |h^2 Q U|^2 e^{-2T/h} d\theta dT$$

for all $U \in C_0^\infty((-\infty, T_0) \times S^1)$, and for all $h \in (0, h_0)$. (The constant $C > 0$ is independent of h .)

Proof. (of the Proposition.) We set $U := e^{T/h} V$ and let

$$\tilde{Q} := h^2 e^{-T/h} \circ Q \circ e^{T/h}.$$

That is,

$$\tilde{Q} = (h\partial_T + 1)^2 + hc(T)(h\partial_T + 1) + (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2.$$

Then the estimate (3) is equivalent to

$$(4) \quad h \iint (|V|^2 + |h\partial_T V|^2 + |h\partial_\theta V|^2 + |h^2\partial_T^2 V|^2 + |h^2\partial_{T,\theta}^2 V|^2 + |h^2\partial_\theta^2 V|^2) e^{\epsilon T} d\theta dT \\ \leq C \iint |\tilde{Q} V|^2 d\theta dT$$

for all $V \in C_0^\infty((-\infty, T_0) \times S^1)$.

For bookkeeping purposes, we write $\tilde{Q}$ as the sum of its symmetric and antisymmetric parts,

$$\tilde{Q} = A + B,$$

where

$$A = h^2 \partial_T^2 + (1 + hc - \frac{1}{2} h^2 c') + (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2,$$

and

$$B = (2 + hc)h\partial_T + \frac{1}{2} h^2 c'.$$

Hence, using the usual inner product notation on L^2 , and with $[A, B] = AB - BA$ denoting the commutator,

$$\iint |\tilde{Q} V|^2 d\theta dT = \|AV\|^2 + \|BV\|^2 + \langle [A, B]V, V \rangle.$$

Repeated integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(5) \quad & \|AV\|^2 = \|h^2\partial_T^2 V\|^2 \\
(6) \quad & + \|(1 + hc - \frac{1}{2}h^2c')V\|^2 \\
& + \|(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2 V\|^2 \\
& + h^3 \langle V, (c'' - \frac{1}{2}hc''')V \rangle \\
& - 2\langle h\partial_T V, (1 + hc - \frac{1}{2}h^2c')h\partial_T V \rangle \\
& - 2\epsilon^3 h^2 \langle h\partial_\theta V, (1 + 2\epsilon e^{\epsilon T})e^{\epsilon T} h\partial_\theta V \rangle \\
& + 2\langle h^2\partial_{T,\theta}^2 V, (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2\partial_{T,\theta}^2 V \rangle \\
(7) \quad & - 2\langle h\partial_\theta V, (1 + hc - \frac{1}{2}h^2c')(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h\partial_\theta V \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|BV\|^2 = \|(2 + hc)h\partial_T V\|^2 - \frac{1}{4}h^4\|c'V\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}h^4\langle V, c''cV \rangle - h^3\langle V, c''V \rangle,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(8) \quad & \langle [A, B]V, V \rangle = -2h^2\langle c'h\partial_T V, h\partial_T V \rangle \\
& - 2h^2\langle c'V, V \rangle + h^3\langle (c'' - cc')V, V \rangle + \frac{1}{2}h^4\langle (cc'' + c''')V, V \rangle \\
& + 2h\epsilon^2\langle (2 + hc)(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})e^{\epsilon T} h\partial_\theta V, h\partial_\theta V \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we recall that

$$c(T) = -\epsilon^2 e^{\epsilon T} (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^{-1}$$

so that

$$c'(T) = -\epsilon^3 e^{\epsilon T} (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^{-2}$$

is also a negative quantity.

Most of the terms in the above expansions may be absorbed into other terms when we take $0 < h$ to be sufficiently small. It is only the term (7) that gives some difficulty. We write (7) as

$$(7') \quad -2\langle h\partial_\theta V, (1 + \lambda hc)(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h\partial_\theta V \rangle - 2\langle h\partial_\theta V, ((1 - \lambda)hc - \frac{1}{2}h^2c')(1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h\partial_\theta V \rangle.$$

Here $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is to be determined; as we will see, any $2 < \lambda < 3$ will suffice.

For the first term of (7'), we use the elementary inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 2\langle (1 + \lambda hc)^{1/2} V, (1 + \lambda hc)^{1/2} (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2 V \rangle \\
 (9) \quad & \geq -\langle (1 + \lambda hc) V, V \rangle \\
 (10) \quad & - \langle (1 + \lambda hc) (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2 V, (1 + \epsilon e^{\epsilon T})^2 h^2 \partial_\theta^2 V \rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now (9) is absorbed into (5) when $\lambda > 2$, and (10) may be absorbed into (6) when $\lambda > 0$ (in both cases we are left with an order h term).

As for the second term in (7'), it may be absorbed into (8) as long as $\lambda < 3$. All the terms are thus accounted for, completing the proof of (4) and of the proposition. $\square$

End of proof of Theorem 2. We write $U(T, \theta) := u(x_1, x_2)$. Since we are only considering $T < T_0 (\ll 0)$, our hypothesized upper bound (2) gives

$$|QU| \leq C e^T (|U| + |\partial_T U| + |\partial_\theta U|).$$

Now we let $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that

$$\begin{cases} \psi = 1 & \text{in } (-\infty, T_0 - 1) \\ \psi = 0 & \text{in } (T_0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

and we set

$$U^\psi(T, \theta) = \psi(T) U(T, \theta).$$

The vanishing hypothesis on u says that for every N there exists a constant C_N such that

$$|u(x)| \leq C_N |x|^N$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, so that, in the new coordinates, for any N we have

$$|U(T, \theta)| \leq C_N e^{NT}$$

for T in a neighborhood of $-\infty$. Therefore

$$\iint |U^\psi|^2 e^{-NT} d\theta dT < \infty$$

for any N . The same argument holds for all derivatives of U^ψ . We then let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that

$$\begin{cases} \chi = 0 & \text{in } (-\infty, -2) \\ \chi = 1 & \text{in } (-1, \infty), \end{cases}$$

and for $R > 0$ we let $\chi_R(T) = \chi(T/R)$. We may apply Proposition 3 to $\chi_R(T) U^\psi(T, \theta)$ and take the limit as $R \rightarrow \infty$; by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, Proposition 3 thus holds for U^ψ .

The righthand side of (3) is then

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \iint |h^2 Q U^\psi|^2 e^{-2T/h} d\theta dT &= h^4 \iint |\psi Q U + \psi'' U + 2\psi' \partial_T U + c\psi' U|^2 e^{-2T/h} d\theta dT \\ &\leq Ch^4 \iint e^{2T} (|U^\psi|^2 + |\partial_T U^\psi|^2 + |\partial_\theta U^\psi|^2) e^{-2T/h} d\theta dT \end{aligned}$$

$$(12) \quad + Ch^4 \int \int_{T_0-1}^{T_0} (|U|^2 + |\partial_T U|^2) e^{-2T/h} d\theta dT.$$

Since $2T < \epsilon T$, the term (11) is bounded by

$$Ch^2 \iint (|U^\psi|^2 + |h\partial_T U^\psi|^2 + |h\partial_\theta U^\psi|^2) e^{-2T/h+\epsilon T} d\theta dT,$$

and hence can be absorbed into the lefthand side of (3) when $h > 0$ is sufficiently small.

Since U and $\partial_T U$ are bounded, the term (12) is bounded by

$$Ch^5 e^{-2(T_0-1)/h}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} h \iint (|U^\psi|^2 + |h\partial_T U^\psi|^2 + |h\partial_\theta U^\psi|^2 + |h^2 \partial_T^2 U^\psi|^2 + |h^2 \partial_{T,\theta}^2 U^\psi|^2 + |h^2 \partial_\theta^2 U^\psi|^2) e^{-2T/h+\epsilon T} d\theta dT \\ \leq Ch^5 e^{-2(T_0-1)/h}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $h \rightarrow 0$, we see that $U = 0$ when $T < T_0 - 1$, as otherwise the left side grows faster than the right side. Hence the original function u vanishes in a neighborhood of the origin.

We have thus shown that the set of points where u vanishes to infinite order is an open set. The complement is obviously also an open set, so by the connectedness of X we have that $u = 0$ in X . This concludes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alinhac and M. S. Baouendi. Uniqueness for the characteristic Cauchy problem and strong unique continuation for higher order partial differential inequalities. *Amer. J. Math.* 102 (1980), no. 1, 179–217.
- [2] N. Aronszajn. A unique continuation theorem for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations or inequalities of second order. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 36 (1957), 235–249.
- [3] T. Carleman. Sur un problème d'unicité pur les systèmes d'équations aux dérivées partielles à deux variables indépendantes. (French) *Ark. Mat., Astr. Fys.* 26, (1939). no. 17, 9 pp.
- [4] L. C. Evans and M. Zworski. Semi-classical analysis, Edition 0.3. www.math.berkeley.edu/~zworski/semiclassical.pdf, 2007.
- [5] M. Gromov. Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds. *Invent. Math.* 82 (1985), no. 2, 307–347.
- [6] P. Hartman and A. Wintner. On the local behavior of solutions of non-parabolic partial differential equations. *Amer. J. Math.* 75 (1953), 449–476.

- [7] D. McDuff and D. Salamon. *J*-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 52. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [8] L. Hörmander. Uniqueness theorems for second order elliptic differential equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 8 (1983), no. 1, 21–64.
- [9] L. Hörmander. The analysis of linear partial differential operators. III. Pseudodifferential operators. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, 274. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

UCLA DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1555, USA

E-mail address: mvanvalk@ucla.edu